



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,971	09/30/2003	Gary K. Michelson	101.0059-02000	4939
22882	7590	09/13/2005		
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O'PINES STREET, NE HARTVILLE, OH 44632				
EXAMINER WILLSE, DAVID H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3738				

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/674,971	MICHELSON, GARY K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dave Willse	3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3738

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 29-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly presented language pertaining to “the opening being at least in part curved across the height of the disc space” (e.g., claim 29, lines 10-11) is nowhere to be found in the original disclosure. In fact, references to a spinal *fusion* implant, “removal of damaged spinal disc material” (US 6,241,770: column 1, lines 10-11), and a disc *space* (*ibidem*: column 1, lines 31-33), along with other passages (*ibidem*: column 3, lines 45-46; column 3, line 67, through column 4, line 3; etc.), suggest otherwise.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 29-36, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Brantigan, US 5,192,327, which discloses forming an opening across a height of a disc space and into a portion of each of the adjacent vertebral bodies (column 2, lines 28-33 and 59-64; column 6, lines 23-36 and 50-52), the opening being at least in part curved across the height of the disc space (Figure 11), and inserting an implant such that a majority of a trailing end of the implant is aligned with the anatomical curvature of the adjacent vertebral bodies and does not substantially protrude from the spine (figures; column 2, lines 1-4; etc.). Regarding claims 31 and 32: column 2, lines 47-50; column 7, lines 21-23. Regarding claim 35: column 2, lines 60-62.

Claims 39-47, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brantigan, US 5,192,327. The aforementioned embodiment (Figures 10 and 11) utilizing a pair of hemi-oval rings (Figure 2) in side-by-side relation would have been an obvious variant in view of the advantages discussed at column 2, lines 7-11, and column 4, lines 57-60. Regarding claim 41, the trailing end is symmetrical relative to a transverse plane bisecting the device **20**.

The Applicant's remarks have been considered. In regard to the Brantigan patent, the Applicant's comments are adequately addressed in the grounds of rejection above. As for Bianchi et al., the limitation that a *majority* of the trailing end be aligned with the anatomical curvature (Applicant's amended claim 29, last three lines) is absent from the original disclosure (of grandparent application serial no. 09/263,266); "[i]t is applicant's burden to precisely define the invention, and not the [examiner's]" (*In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1056, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1029 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). If the Applicant's embodiments shown in Figure 10 (US 6,241,770 B1: column 8, lines 59-65; instant claim 41) and Figures 15A and 15B meet this newly added

Art Unit: 3738

limitation, then so do the Bianchi et al. implants illustrated in Figures 8 and 9 of US 6,033,438.

The double patenting rejections and the Bianchi et al. rejection have been withdrawn because of the new matter added to the claims (MPEP 2163.06) and *not* because of the Applicant's arguments.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse whose telephone number is 571-272-4762. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Dave Willse
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738